

The Classical Bulletin

Published monthly from November through April by the Department of Classical Languages at Saint Louis University, Saint Louis 3, Missouri. Subscription price: \$2.00 a year. Entered as second-class matter at the Saint Louis, Missouri, Post-Office under the Act of March 3, 1879.

VOLUME 36

NOVEMBER 1959

NUMBER 1

"Flentibus Amicis"—Horace, *Sat.* 1.5.93

The intriguing problem of the real significance of Horace's famous *Journey to Brundisium* has been a familiar tilting ground for critics. A re-reading of this satire in an atmosphere of rustication may reveal some of the inner meaning of certain phases of Horace's sly humor. An over-emphasis on the apparatus of scholarship may in this case cloud the issue. Here the modern critic might profit from the application of the principle of the primary importance of the text in contra-distinction to the *marginalia*. In the text of *Sat.* 1.5.93 we are presented with two simple reportorial statements telescoped into a single verse: *Flentibus hinc [hic] Varius discedit maestus amicis*. Varius was loath to leave the group of travelers at Canusium. His friends wept at his departure.

Before arriving at Canusium in Apulia the party, which included Maecenas, Horace, Plotius Tucca, Vergil, and Varius, had passed through several towns, Maecenas, Cocceius and Fonteius Capito were undertaking a diplomatic trip in order to reconcile *aversos amicos* (29). The question of the date and occasion of this journey has been discussed with considerable acumen in recent issues of *The Classical World*.¹ It is sufficient to emphasize here the frequent reference to Epicurean friendship throughout this satire and especially in the verses describing the arrival of Plotius, Varius, and Vergil at Sinuessa. The passage need not be cited in full. In verse 44 we have what appears to be an Epicurean definition of a *iucundus amicus*.

Progress Along the Way

The little town at which the party stayed before reaching Canusium is, in the Lucilian manner, not named: *quod versu dicere non est*. It can be identified, we are told, by the fact that water was for sale there, but on the other hand the town furnished bread of an admirable quality. The bread at Canusium was gritty and moreover did not provide a jugful more of water (91-93):

Nam Canusi lapidosus, aquae non ditior urna,
qui locus a forti Diomede est conditus olim.
Flentibus hinc Varius discedit maestus amicis.

The repeated theme of the scarcity of water might lead a reader to believe that Horace merely wished jocosely to imply that a plentiful supply of water in the form of tears was provided by the departure of Varius. This is a feeble joke at its best. Again, it is

In this issue . . .

"Flentibus Amicis"—Horace, <i>Sat.</i> 1.5.93	John J. Savage	1
Cicero <i>De Se Ipso</i> (<i>Fam.</i> 7.3)	William Hardy Alexander	4
Educators and the Bellingshausen Sea	Editorial	6
Verse: Hesiod	Charles R. Hart	7
Light-Darkness Imagery in <i>Oedipus Tyrannus</i>	Edward F. Salmon, S.J.	8
Verse: To Saint John Berchmans	Paul L. Callens, S.J.	9
<i>Breviora</i> : Simple Scholarship Grant for Athens (Grace L. Beede, page 10). On a Review of Mohrmann's <i>Liturgical Latin</i> (Francis Joseph Guentner, S.J., page 10).		
<i>Book Reviews</i> : Robert Payne, <i>The Gold at Troy</i> (Timothy Horner, O.S.B., page 10). Aurelio R. Bujaldon, editor, <i>Cicero</i> (Timothy Horner, O.S.B., page 11). Donald C. Bryant, editor, <i>The Rhetorical Idiom</i> (Timothy Horner, O.S.B., page 11). H. M. D. Parker, <i>The Roman Legions</i> , reprinting (William Charles Korfmacher, page 12).		
Materials Available through the Office of THE CLASSICAL BULLETIN		12

argued that Horace may well have incorporated a humorous scene from Lucilius at this point.²

Critics seem to have made little of the reference to the foundation of Canusium by Diomedes, a reference which at first sight seems to be a casual one. But why did Varius leave the party at this stage, and why did his friends feel so downcast at his departure to the extent of bursting into tears?

Varius was famous in Horace's day as a writer of epic. He is characterized by Horace as *acer* ("spirited"), and his epic is described as *forte* (*Sat.* 1.10.43-44). He is frequently cited along with Vergil: *Vergilius Variusque poetae*.³ The title of Varius' epic is not mentioned anywhere in extant Latin literature. In one of his early odes addressed to Agrippa (1.6.1-4) Horace merely refers to the interest of Varius in Homeric epic as a reason why Agrippa should call upon him rather than upon a writer of lighter verse like Horace himself to record his heroic deeds:

Scriberis Vario fortis et hostium
victor Maconii carminis alite,
quam rem cumque ferox navibus aut equis
miles te duce gesserit.

This ode was written after 29 B.C. when Agrippa had returned from his campaigns in the East. As Varius was born about 74, he would have been about forty-four years old at the time when Horace referred to him as "a bird of Maeonian song."

The epic of Varius, unidentified by name, had already been composed when Horace recorded his incomparable achievement in that *genre* (*Sat.* 1.10.43): *forte epos acer, ut nemo, Varius ducit*. The first book of Horace's *Saturae* was published in 35-34, when Varius was about forty years old. The use of the future tense in the first verse of the sixth ode points to the fact that Varius had not yet written an epic on the military and naval victories of Agrippa. Horace merely assures Agrippa that Varius will do so, and that he is capable of doing justice to the theme which is on a par with the deeds of gods and heroes, including those of Diomedes, in the fifth book of the *Ilias*:

Quis Martem tunica tectum adamantina
digne scripserit aut pulvere Troico
nigrum Merionen aut ope Palladis
Tydiden superis parem?

Is it purely coincidental that the two Greek heroes mentioned in this ode (1.6.13-16) by Horace were associated in one way or another with settlements in Southern Italy? Meriones was the charioteer of the Cretan hero Idomeneus, who was driven out of his native land by a plague and finally settled in Calabria. Diomedes settled in Apulia after a series of misfortunes which he attributed to the wrath of Aphrodite, whom he had wounded in a conflict against some of the gods in the Trojan war (*superis parem*).⁴

Three Factors in "Amicorum Lacrimae"

At Canusium, a city which, as Horace expressly tells us, was founded by the Homeric hero Diomedes, the departure of Varius caused his friends to weep. Appreciation of the humor here is conditioned by three factors. There is first the recognition of a rhetorical device, well described in a fragment of Theophrastus which states that "you must not express everything with precise elaboration but leave some things for your hearer (or reader) to perceive or work out for himself."⁵ Horace was conscious of applying stylistic norms of this type. He has proposed such principles in his criticism of his predecessor in this *genre*.⁶ There may be some significance in the introduction of *rheto comes Heliodorus*⁷ at the beginning of this satire with the humorous and exaggerated description: *Graecorum longe doctissimus*. Again, appreciation of Horace's humor in mentioning the curious circumstances of Varius' departure at Canusium is conditioned not so much by his hearer's admiration of the satirist's art of taut expression as by the knowledge of the mythical connection of Diomedes with the region around Canusium. Finally the hearer would recognize the parody of epic style here as elsewhere through this poem. The departure of a hero, in true epic fashion, would call for copious tears from his friends (cf. *Odyseea* 10 *passim*).

What then are the implications of the expression *flentibus amicis* which would be likely to bring to the attention of Horace's hearers a bizarre association of ideas? We should expect gentle but harmless satire here at the expense of his friend Varius. The satire is understandable if we assume that Varius was interested in the story of Diomedes and especially in the legends concerning his various settlements in the region of Canusium. Vergil, friend and rival of Varius in the field of epic, may well furnish us with a clue to the meaning of the elusive phrase *flentibus amicis* in connection with Diomedes.

Diomedes in Vergil

In the eleventh book of the *Aeneis*, Venulus, a Latin chieftain, announces the failure of his mission to the city of Argyrippa in Apulia (246-247) to win over the Argive Diomedes and his forces to the side of the Latins and the Rutulians. Venulus reports in full the speech of Diomedes in which he pleads for a reconciliation with Aeneas with whom Diomedes feels great sympathy because of the similar circumstances which accompanied their exile and settlement in Italy. Diomedes stresses especially the grief he experienced in the loss of his comrades who were transformed into water-fowl, filling the cliffs with their tearful cries (272-274):

Et socii amissi petierunt aethera pennis
fluminibusque vagantur aves (heu, dira meorum
supplicia!) et scopulos lacrimosis vocibus implent.

Here Vergil seems to have given a clue to the significance of Horace's enigmatic phrase *flentibus amicis*. Vergil's picture of the rocky abodes of Diomedes' birds may throw some light on the humor of Horace's dry point sketch of Canusium and its surroundings. The bread at Canusium was gritty (*lapidosus*). The association of the rocky surroundings of the town with the quality of the bread is a strained one, to say the least. Horace seems to be leading up to the mental picture of the *socii* of Diomedes—the assumed hero of the epic of Varius—in the act of being metamorphosed into water-fowl haunting with their "tearful cries" the rocky sea coast near Canusium. According to the legend, this transformation took place in the little rocky islands (modern Tremiti) off the northeast coast of the peninsula of Garganus. Canusium lay in a south-westerly direction not far from this peninsula. Diomedes, according to one version of the story, survived the events which led to the metamorphosis of his comrades.⁸

Horace presents us with a strange association of ideas. He juxtaposes the mention of Canusium, one of Diomedes' foundations in Apulia, with a reference to the sudden and unaccountable departure of Varius:

qui locus a forti Diomede est conditus olim.
Flentibus hinc Varius discedit maestus amicis.

These verses take on a new dimension, once we assume that Horace himself by implication in his ode to Agrippa (1.6.13-16) shadows forth the theme of Varius' celebrated epic. Furthermore, it is not impossible that traces of the content of that lost epic may still be found, as we have stated, in the episode of Latinus' embassy to Diomedes in the eleventh book of the *Aeneis*. The humorous implications of the sorrowful departure of Varius at Canusium can be appreciated by the present-day reader only if he assumes the existence of a work—presumably by Varius himself—in which the metamorphosis of Diomedes' companions was treated. Three at least of the participants in this famous *Journey*, the author Horace, Vergil, and Varius himself, were well aware of the details of the story of the metamorphosis of Diomedes' companions into "birds who fill the air and the rocky cliffs with their tearful cries." Varius was sad at his departure. His friends put on a comic show of grief: *solventur risu—lacrimae*.

The element of parody of epic style which pervades this satire culminates in the laconic reference to the grief of Varius and the tears of his companions at his departure at Canusium. At times throughout the satire we are given the impression that both the author and Vergil assume the languid airs of the artist and the *litterateur* in the midst of all this pomp and circumstance. They sleep while Maecenas and his group go off to play (48-49). Before the arrival of Maecenas and his troupe Horace applies lotion to his eyes (30)—a slight satirical touch.⁹ His poetic *Reisetagebuch* reveals his real interests to be not political intrigue nor contemporary history but rather Italian life as expressed in literature. This interest Horace has set his stamp on throughout this medley of fact and fiction.

Epic and Other Parody

It does not seem to have been noticed that this satire with its frequent parody of the epic (20, 53, 74, 93) has interspersed in it slight parodies of several other *genres*. The incident of the reception at Fundi (34-36) by the praetor dressed in his best toga with purple border and stripe could have recalled some scene from a *fabula togata*. The setting of this type of play was often laid in a provincial town. The purpose of such a comedy was to raise a laugh at the expense of the provincials.¹⁰ The description (71-76) of the scene of turmoil at the inn in Beneventum could probably have found a parallel in some lost *fabula tabernaria*. The so-called *fabula Atellana*, a farce-comedy of a more literary form, took delight in character sketches such as "The Fool as Mine Host" (*Maccus Copo*).¹¹ The note of political satire in the description of the contest between the two *scurrae* (51-70) has been noticed.¹² There is

much here that might have been suggested by a scene in some current mime. There is a definite—but perhaps exaggerated—lyrical note (cf. *Carm.* 1.3.5-8 to Vergil; 2.7.27 to Pompeius) in the praise of Horace's friends, Plotius, Varius, and Vergil, who joined the party at Sinuessa (39-44). Horace seems to hint at another literary type—the hymn—in the single verse in which a divinity of a spring is invoked (24). There is an element of parody (washing face and hands in a sacred spring) and satire here. Varro equated Feronia with *Fidonia, dea Libertatis*.¹³ The subject of still another literary type—the erotic elegy—is suggested by the two verses on the poet's frustrated love affair (83-85).¹⁴ Horace's well-known dislike of the proponents of this *genre* seems to have found expression in the vulgar tone of this passage. To cap it all, Horace introduces at the very beginning of his satire, in humorously exaggerated language, *rhetor comes Heliodorus Graecorum longe doctissimus*. The Greek rhetor seems, in humorous fashion, to represent Horace's own art, the art of expression in the form of satire, a typically Roman literary product. The rhetor is merely mentioned in passing before the narrative begins. He seems to take the place of the conventional Muse in the guise of a professor of literature to serve as an appropriate introductory motive to a satire which appears to include a congeries of various *genres*, including the most important one for this occasion, history.

There is a certain gravity in Horace's description of the arrival of Maecenas, Octavian's representative, and the two legates who represent Antony: *missi magnis de rebus* (28). The note of satire on this political event seems to be expressed in the verse: *legati aversos soliti componere amicos*. Around this central panel we seem to find references to the literary *genres* of drama, elegy, lyric, epic, and finally bucolic. The satire reaches what appears to be a climax with the epic note on Varius. This climax, however, is followed by what appears to be an anticlimax in the story of the marvelous happening at Gnatia with the poet's incisive criticism: *credat Iudaeus Apella, non ego*.¹⁵ This is a satire on the optimism concerning the future of the state as illustrated especially by Vergil in his fourth *Ecloga*. These verses of Horace furnish us with a clue to the real meaning of the entire satire:¹⁶ the futility of peace treaties such as that of Brundisium of a few years previously. Better, Horace states, to have faith in Epicurean realism based on *Natura* than to rely on such fancies as were shadowed forth in the famed bucolic poem of his friend. One of the concluding verses of Horace:

... namque deos didici securum agere aevum,
nec, si quid miri faciat natura, deos id
tristis ex alto caeli demittere tecto,

is an echo of a verse in Vergil's bucolic poem (4.7): *iam nova progenies caelo demittitur alto*. The first of

these verses of Horace, as is well known, is a close approximation to a line in the fifth book of Lucretius (82), where Lucretius brings forward arguments against teleological as opposed to natural explanations of the world.

Sat. 1.10 Complementary to Sat. 1.5

In keeping with the good-natured banter of the rest of the satire, we are not to take this apparent criticism of Vergil's famous poem as ultra-serious. There is, of course, an element of greater seriousness in this criticism if read after the hopelessness of reconciliation between the former friends, Octavian and Antony, had become evident. Horace's strictures were intended to arouse laughter in accordance with his principle "to tell the truth with a smile." Later on in this same book Horace amply atones for this seeming severity by expressing himself as highly pleased with the charm and grace of Vergil's rustic poems (10.44-45). The tenth satire is, in fact, a serious apology for the fifth. Horace's friends, including Vergil and Varius, he hopes, will approve of the style and content of his satires (81-90).

The tenth satire (40-49) is in the nature of an epilogue to the fifth as well as to the fourth satire. In his *Journey* Horace has made sport of contemporary dramatic art as exemplified in farce-comedy. Horace found a precedent for the introduction into a satire of literary criticism in the *Iter Siculum* of Lucilius (3.140; 148 M. on Accius; of 9.348 M.). He had treated the epic lightly (*flentibus amicis*) and had, so to speak, Lucretianized the fourth *Ecloga* which celebrated Pollio's consulship. Now in the tenth satire he turns the tables (40-49). To each writer his individual talent. Horace claims for himself preeminence in satire over all other writers except Lucilius. A living author like Fundanius can excel in depicting comic characters in a *fabula palliata*. Pollio sings the deeds of princes in iambic trimeters. Vergil presents us with all the charm and grace (*molle atque facetum*) of the rustic muse. Varius is a perceptive artist (*acer*) and brings into form a noble epic (*forte epos*).

The conclusions reached in this re-reading of the fifth Satire of Horace stemmed from the recognition of what appears to be an association of a reference to the founding of Canusium by Diomedes with an incident in the life of the hero (transformation of his companions into sorrowing birds) which is reflected in Virgil's *Aeneis* and in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (14.498-511). The assumption that Varius' lost epic was a *Diomedea* rests on this apparent association of ideas. Support for this hypothesis is brought forward from a re-appraisal of the sixth ode, addressed to Varius, of the first book of Horace. Further evidence for the hypothesis that Horace in his satire

(Continued on page 9)

Cicero De Se Ipso (Fam. 7.3)

The life of classic Rome is a very long life indeed and, on the whole, a very distinguished life even in its villainies, if one may so put it; there is nothing small about it even in its meanness. There are in it, however, certain notable "crash-points," as we might call them nowadays, and very tragical among these I should rank the collapse of the Republic in the last quinquennium of Julius Caesar's life, directly due to his policies and actions in the matter and concurrent weaknesses in his opponents. This meant, of course, the involvement in this "crash" of the last of the distinguished Republicans, Marcus Tullius Cicero. It would be a most interesting speculative effort did we have to make it, to seek to portray the feelings of Cicero at that time, but here is one place where we are absolutely excused from the need of a speculation. Cicero's extraordinarily clear *Ad Familiares* 7.3 (directed to M. Marius), characterized by its (for Cicero) remarkable compression and self-restraint, constitutes a wonderful picture of the orator and statesman in the depths, and provides a clear explanation of how he got there. Since his getting there absolutely coincides with one of the most significant points in all history, the *apologia pro vita sua*, written to describe some very dark hours on the 12th of May, 49 B.C., and following days, invites our profoundest attention, not only for its historical value, but for its crystal-clear Latinity.

Cicero's Agitation

Cicero had been so agitated, he explains, in the latter half of 49, that he could scarcely make up his mind what to do; he could hardly find at all any *explicatio* from the meshes of the political net in which he was rapidly becoming involved. This net was threaded from political honor on the one hand and personal safety on the other. Then at last he decided definitely for Pompey and followed him in the flight from Italy to the Balkan peninsula. Almost immediately he found occasion to question the decision he had made. Pompey's troops were in very low condition indeed, officered—and who would be better able to judge this point than Cicero?—by the moral insolvency of men of the highest rank, senators namely, who were breathing out fire and slaughter against all the Caesarian party, *de haut en bas*; "nothing sound about them but their cause." Cicero promptly advised Pompey (wisely at bottom) for an indefinite protraction of the war and a basing of the Pompeian cause upon the east (Asia Minor, Syria, Egypt). But Pompey was unlucky enough to win an unduly magnified skirmish at Dyrrhachium. On the basis of this he yielded to his bloodthirsty advisers, and presently at Pharsalus "gave battle with his untrained and hastily assembled army to the most hard-bitten legions in the world (*legionibus robustis*).

simis)." How did it end? Simply this: *solus fugit*. What a shattering picture in simplest Latin of a great military reputation absolutely and irretrievably wrecked, only fit henceforth to become the subject of Lucan's *Pharsalia*, an epic with its flashes of genius, it is true, but painfully protracted at that!

What was Cicero to do? He had before him, categorically, six possibilities, he says (*Fam.* 7.3.3.): (a) death in battle (what battle and where? we may ask); (b) a fall into some sort of ambush; (c) a passage into the conqueror's hands; (d) a taking refuge with Juba, a subject kinglet in the Roman political system; (e) a finding of some spot which would be virtually though not positively exile; (f) a facing of suicide. If there was no moral stigma involved, exile was at least endurable (oh Cicero, at Tomi, for instance?) or rather, least unendurable, especially if you felt your position was strictly honorable from the moral point of view.

Cicero's Choice after Pharsalus

It was a form of that, practically, that he chose, namely, to go on living at Rome (to which he had returned from Pompey's attempted last stand in Thrace), among, obviously, many bitter critics at the best, and, probably, many more downright malignant foes at the worst. Thus he is found at Rome at the time of writing the *Ad Familiares* 7.3, namely, the middle of May, 46. Caesar meantime had gone on into eastern parts; and eventually into Africa and Spain. It might have been better that Cicero should have been in contact with him promptly at the capital on his return, but who can say?

"Now, my dear Marius," writes Cicero, "I never desired that any one man should outbalance in power the State as a whole, but when owing to the fault of a certain individual"—how Cicero does hate here to name the name; it is mentioned only once in this fairly long letter!—"there was left one man suffi-

ciently strong to put resistance out of the question, well, I was all for peace and resolved to end the war-policy among the rest of our party if I could, but in any event to drop it as far as I was concerned; then, if there is a State, I hold a citizenship in it, or if I don't, I am an exile, to be sure, but in a more convenient place than if I had taken myself off to Rhodes or Mitylene." Yes, Cicero, you are right; if a head must be lost, far better that it should happen only a few miles from Rome than that it should be reft from your body like that of the luckless Pompey on the coast of distant Egypt! But it was not against Caesar that your head had to be ventured, but rather in the end against Caesar's cold-blooded heir Octavian and his henchman Mark Antony, and that raises a question I cannot answer; did you, Cicero, really play the game fairly between Caesar on the one side and Brutus and his fellow-conspirators on the other? And if you did not, how then stood your account with honor? I would like to be surer, Cicero, and then my admiration could be something more; as it is, there is that which I must withhold.

And the more so perhaps because what left Cicero on the hooks in this civil contest was the fact that Caesar had always treated him with every consideration; also that Caesar, as himself a man of letters of no mean standing, admired Cicero as Pompey never did and never could have done. Still, the more I write and the more I reflect, the better I grasp the fearful tangles that ethical differences can evolve. It may be better then to say no more *à ce sujet*, but just to leave it *sur les genoux des dieux*. There must be many persons who will read these lines who have known, and in all probability will again know in their own political experience, how hard and bitter the choice can be on voting day between principle and honor.

Moreover, what led me to the writing of this article was not really the passionate problem of moral judgment which it poses, but the exceeding clarity of the way in which *Ad Familiares* 7.3 is written. In it we face a very important question in the interpretation of Roman history, and we can be thankful for the clarity of the writing and the soundness of the language. It is not just a question of *loqui* but of *latine loqui*, and this, it seems to me, is a matter of very practical importance in our teaching of Latin prose composition. I say "our teaching of," because I hope and pray that it is being taught, regarding it as I do as a most valuable and honorable study. But if it is to be taught, I can hardly think of a better ground of operations than the *Ad Familiares* of Cicero, where the use of written language as the means of the intercourse of gentlemen is so inimitably set forth.

William Hardy Alexander

Edmonton, Alberta

Again Available

Leo M. Kaiser,

T. Maccius Plautus, The Captives: Edited, with Introduction, Notes, and Vocabulary. This popular edition of the *Captivi*, heretofore available in mimeographed form, has now been planographed in a new and attractive format, with slight revisions. Orders may be placed now, for delivery at once.

Address: THE CLASSICAL BULLETIN
221 North Grand Boulevard
Saint Louis 3, Missouri

Price: \$1.25 per copy, plus postage.

The Classical Bulletin

Published by the Department of Classical Languages
at Saint Louis University

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

William Charles Korfmacher.....	Editor
Chauncey Edgar Finch.....	Associate Editor
Francis Joseph Guentner, S.J.....	Associate Editor
Marcus Anthony Haworth, S.J.....	Associate Editor
Claude Herman Heithaus, S.J.....	Associate Editor
Francis Charles Hunleth, S.J.....	Associate Editor
Lawrence Frederick Jansen, S.J.....	Associate Editor

Address: 221 North Grand Boulevard, Saint Louis 3, Missouri
Subscription: \$2.00 per year. Single copies: 40c. To members
of the ACL, CAAS, CAMWS, CANE, and CAPS, \$1.60 per
year through the Office of the Secretary-Treasurer of each
of these organizations.

Concerning subscriptions, renewals, books, pamphlets, adver-
tising, and the like, please address the Editor. Concerning
manuscripts for possible publication, address any member
of the Committee.

Volume 36 November 1959 Number 1

EDITORIAL

Educators and the Bellingshausen Sea

A report from the North American News Alliance appearing on November 10, 1959, states that two icebreakers of the United States Navy will this winter explore the Bellingshausen Sea, a body of water southwest of the Palmer Peninsula, which is an extension of Antarctica facing South America. "No vessel to date," it is pointed out in the news report, "has been able to traverse <the sea> from shore to shore."

Thus in our own day, with all the eeriness of distance and the unfamiliar, we have a replica of those many regions of land and water which the ancient geographers did not know or knew of but vaguely. Then, as now, *omne ignotum pro magnifico*—"the unknown is ever fraught with marvels." Yet sober scientific report today speaks of "parhelia" or mock suns, "parselenae" or mock moons, solar coronae, fogbows or "arches of yellowish-white light," iridescent clouds of dazzling colors, and earth shadows that "create a 'looming landscape' effect which can be confusing to navigators." Such is the strange lake discovered almost a century and a half ago by Admiral Fabian von Bellingshausen of the imperial Russian Navy—a modern *Pontus Axeinos* or "Inhospitable Sea," like that first successfully cruised over, as mythology says, by the intrepid Jason and his crew of Argonauts.

Were all such phenomena limited to the realm of the merely geographical, modern society would be the more blessed. But it is distressing to realize that today's educators are, as it were, afloat on a Bellingshausen Sea of their own; and in their gallant effort to traverse it from shore to shore, supplying all the manifold needs of today's society and tomorrow's,

they, too, are beset by parhelia and parselenae and captivated by "looming landscapes" appearing as if they were sure and solid land.

At the secondary and college levels no long-established subject may now feel sure of its place. Re-evaluation and reappraisal are the increasing rule, and the worth of a discipline in the past falls so far short of guaranteeing it a continuing place in the curriculum as to be almost an argument against its continuance. If such a statement seems to smack of entrenched conservatism, it may not seem awry to suggest that the drive for change for change's sake, for the new because of sheer novelty, suggests powerfully the attraction to the "mock suns" of the strange Antarctic Sea, phenomena which there may befuddle and betray the navigator. Nor are the parselenae of those southern skies without parallel to the educators' own Bellingshausen Sea; for there are "mock moons" in the unregulated and undue emphasis many persons highly placed in education would now lay on cosmic research and navigation. To be sure, such inquiries and achievements may well be of such staggering effectiveness as ultimately to benefit the human race beyond all present imagining. Yet such benefits are at the present time tentative. Perhaps the lay observer may wistfully calculate the tremendous conventional uses to which he could put small portions of the billions of dollars consumed in space research by government agencies.

Linguistically, the classical languages and even good English may pale before Bellingshausen's iridescent clouds, floating so jauntily in the educational navigators' ken. The bounds of our world have enlarged, as all men know—and there is a proper appeal in languages remote and little taught. Surely, again, sound evaluation would recognize the need to study such tongues—but not to the extent that "foreign languages" should become identified with "modern languages," and that, too, with an undue and inflated emphasis on languages of an almost esoteric character for the larger proportion of students. It cannot be said too often that the splendid current revival in foreign language study may not prudently be of *this* or *that* specific language alone. Rather, the emphasis should be on linguistic experience—and this can be had in *any* foreign language, ancient or modern.

All in all, today's educators are often far too ready to mistake insubstantial "looming landscapes" for the firm shores of true educational goals. We need to keep in mind proven and worthy havens for the curricular ship—and these harbors will often show themselves to be far more commodious than we had supposed, far more capable of accommodating themselves to the enlarged loads of current educational needs than new quays hastily planned and flimsily constructed.

—W. C. K.

Hesiod

A hundred cities looked upon the sea
In Hellas, but a few were hid away
Among the mountains, Chaeronea one,
Orchomenus another, and a third
Was Thebes, a famous city each of them,
But lacking something of the heritage
That other towns enjoyed, the fellowship
Of the far-gleaming many colored waters
That separate and yet unite so well
So many islands and such far-flung shores.
Boeotia is a melancholy place:
Helicon and Parnassus tower above,
But with their fairer slopes turned to the west
And Delphi. Man seems little at the base
Of those stern heights that see the rising sun,
Born to fulfill a narrow destiny.

Yet, strangely, when the fires of genius dimmed
That gave us Homer, they were not rekindled
Along the shore, but in these fastnesses
Where ploughmen strove to till a barren soil.
There Hesiod followed Homer, and there came
Boeotia after Asia. On its fringe,
Along the borders of the ancient east,
Hellas first found a voice, and now the impulse
Was passing west, where the Achaeans dwelt,
To whom the tongue of Homer was not strange,
In which Aeolic with Ionic joined
To form a poet's language. Dorians
Had yet to find a poet of their own.

For Hesiod the tie was even stronger
Between Boeotia and the farther shore
Of the Aegean, whence his parents came.
To find (how could they think that they would find?)
Good fortune in this land of little promise.
They fixed their home at Ascra on the side
Of Helicon. Thebes was not distant far
With all its legends that would be the theme
Of tragic poets in the years to come,
Legends that could not cheer the heart of one
Who sadly drove his oxen to and fro
To till a soil that yielded little gain.

Yet it may be to one of their two sons,
(the younger Hesiod, and the older Perses
Who had in him but little of poet's fire) ;
These immigrants had given the very soil
In which he ought to grow, for near at hand
Were all the glens and groves of Helicon,
Amid whose pines the wind made such a music
As often may be heard beside the sea,
And from whose crest to look on peak and peak
Was not unlike a glance from isle to isle
Across the Aegean. Is there any land
That has so many outlooks upon space?

Now Hesiod was a shepherd on those heights,
And if he did not meet, as legend tells,
The Muses there, the nine who govern song,
He felt the stirrings which the Greeks of old
Embodied in fair forms, and heard the summons
To be a poet, not in epic guise
Like Homer (the heroic days were gone)
But in a manner now more near allied
To living in a hovel on a hill
Where every farmer tilled a thankless soil.

Yes, he would write a poem of the poor,
A humble poem on a sober theme,
Picturing truly old Boeotia
As Homer pictured Ithaca and Troy.
But, as he wrote, a tone of bitterness
Crept in, when he discovered that the hand
That wounds us may not be an enemy's
But our own brother's, for his parents died,
And Perses took more than his proper share
Of their inheritance, small though it was.
The heart of earth was cold—was man's heart too?
Husbandry henceforth was not all his theme,
As he urged justice too. Thus he today
Who would expound the one, pleads for the other.

Thus Hesiod composed *The Works and Days*,
A poem of the soil and of the debt
Of sweat and tears that man must pay to it,
Thus he expressed, before great Sophocles,
The theme of many tragic choruses.
Life is uncertain and the middle way,
The way of wisdom and humility,
Alone can save as from a hapless end.

Epilogue

Such was the author of the *Works and Days*.
Who left us too the long *Theogony*
With its harsh legends of the strife of gods
And its dour vistas of the nether world.
Can these two poems fall from one same hand?

Above bare fields that needy farmers tilled,
Or tried to till, were pastures, and, still higher,
The rocky ridge where Hesiod once would climb,
E'en when the lightnings flashed and thunder rolled,
To view the warring of the elements.
So once the gods had battled on Olympus.

The mountain gave the poet both his themes,
And you must look to Helicon to know
The unity pervading every line.

Charles R. Hart

Emory University

Light-Darkness Imagery in *Oedipus Tyrannus*

The scene between Oedipus and Tiresias in the *Oedipus Tyrannus* might easily be dismissed as merely another element to develop the plot and move the action along. F. J. H. Letters, however, in his book *The Life and Work of Sophocles*, points out that Sophocles was the first Greek dramatist to conceive of his play as complete in itself, whereas others before him thought in terms of a trilogy.¹ This way of thinking on the part of Sophocles resulted in a more tightened structure; sharp motivation determines entrances and exits; in short, Sophocles' work is quite compact and complex. It is then, not only understandable, but almost expected, that this or any other scene would contain more than meets the eye. This scene not only moves the plot along, but comments upon the total theme of the play and also intensifies it and the problems which Sophocles treats through his presentation of Oedipus and those with whom he comes into contact.

The imagery and symbols found throughout the play attain meaning and give form to the scene by reason of the conflict between Oedipus and Tiresias, in whose persons the images are centered. This conflict between the characters has three levels: the actual argument between them as two people; the clash of the images associated with each of them; and, finally, the struggle between the powers which the images symbolize. The conflict on all these levels gives form to this scene as does conflict in one shape or another give form to the whole play.

The Scene and the Whole Play

When the scene is isolated for the sake of analysis, the light-darkness imagery does not appear so clearly perhaps as it does when the play is read through or examined in its entirety.² The imagery here centers not so much upon light and darkness as such, but rather upon those elements which light and darkness symbolize. Oedipus says to Tiresias: "*Night* nurtures you, so you can never hurt me or anyone else who sees the *light*" (O.T. 374-375). "Night," says the *Dictionary of Folklore*, "is everywhere synonymous with darkness, and wherever the dualism of good and bad is equated with light and dark, night is equivalent to evil and death."³ However ironically it may be done, Oedipus, who possesses his physical sight, attributes to Tiresias, whom he taunts with being τυφλός in eye, ear, and mind, all the qualities associated with night, that is, blindness, disease, death, and evil. In the same breath he attributes to himself the ability to see, φῶς, which may mean not only "light" in the sense of daylight, but also the light of life, or victory and glory, or the illumination of the mind. While Oedipus probably means nothing more than the light of day, all these other connotations are included and the conflict rises to the second level. Night has been set in opposition to light.

Symbolically now, on the third level, good is struggling with evil, life with death, illumination of the mind with what appears before the eyes. Perhaps, then, the conflict between Oedipus and Tiresias is saying that good and evil are constantly struggling. Neither one can destroy the other (C.T. 375-376, 448). But by a divine decree both must go on through time until one triumphs over the other, and whichever may conquer, it will be in accord with the will of "heaven."

Tiresias as Typifying Fate

Tiresias is the minister of Apollo and as such represents Fate or Heaven or Eternal Laws, briefly, the will of the gods.⁴ Oedipus, with his very headstrong personality and firm determination to fulfill the oracle of the god which has declared he must discover and do away with the cause of the plague in the city, represents the existence of the individual free will. The conflict between the two characters now rises to the third level and represents the struggle or the separation between the human free will and the divine will. We see Oedipus, for example, exercising his free will as he drives on to discover his birth and origins. He carries on this search despite the warning of Tiresias, who represents the divine will, and Tiresias' refusal to cooperate. But with each new accession of knowledge to which Oedipus comes in his quest for the truth, the separation between the human will and the divine will becomes narrower and narrower until the two merge into one. The conflict as it resolves seems to say that both the free will of the individual man and the will of heaven or of the gods can and must exist in the world together. Neither is able to destroy the other. Nevertheless, the will of the gods will in the end be triumphant through some strange mystery of the universe which dictates that, though man may do as he will, somehow or other the divine decrees will be fulfilled. "For no man on earth can force the gods to do what they will not" (O.T. 280-281).

This scene between Oedipus and Tiresias draws together and portrays in the conflict between them, the symbolism and images which function throughout the play. The irony, perhaps at its highest peak throughout this scene, catches in its camera and flashes on the screen the conflict and the theme of the play. Tiresias' concluding speeches present what will happen to Oedipus in the physical realm, though not the spiritual development and realization which come as a result of his blinding himself to the things he could see with his eyes. In short, this scene between Oedipus and Tiresias may be termed a microcosm of the total thing which is the play.

Edward F. Salmon, S.J.

Bellarmino College,
Plattsburgh, New York

1 F. J. H. Letters, *The Life and Work of Sophocles* (London: Duckworth, 1912), p. 36-51. 2 *Mythology*, supra, n. 3. For discussion of a present prophecy time, cf. 1957) 45.

To Saint John Berchmans

Hilarem Datorem Diligit Deus

Fastidit Dominus munera divitum
Tristi lata manu; plus viduae valet
Quam pleni loculi drachmula pauperis
Quae cum fronte hilari datur.

Hic vere dator est qui placuit Deo;
Nam si pauca dedit, cuncta tamen dedit.
Mercator sapiens nunc bene possidet
Caelo sepositas opes.

Quas pugnas obiit? Quos domuit feros
Hostes hic iuvenis? Quae spolia attulit?
Et victor celebres ad superos vehi
Qua tandem meruit via?

Non magnos titulos, nec diademata
Calcavit pedibus; pauper et infimus
Christi discipulus, fovit humillima:
Parvus parva dedit Deo.

Nullis hunc populus plausibus extulit,
Nec cinxit teneris tempora floribus,
Victoris tribuens praemia. Sanctulo
Quid refert hilari meo?

Quos ignes animo supposuit sacros
Christi castus amor perpetuos alit
Vestalisque modo virginis appetit
Custos esse vigil foci.

Laetis fert umeris dulce Dei iugum.
Facti propositi nemo tenacior:
"Disrumpar potius quam minimis," ait,
"Promissis renuam meis."

O Berchmans, gravidam fronte sodalium
Nubem tristitiae pelle; clientibus
Praesta sic hilari vivere spiritu
Ut semper placeant Deo!

Paul L. Callens, S.J.

Saint Charles College,
Grand Coteau, Louisiana

NOTES

1 F. J. H. Letters, *The Life and Work of Sophocles* (London 1953) 111-112. 2 For a fuller treatment and discussion of the general imagery in the play, cf. Herbert Musurillo, "Sunken Imagery in Sophocles' Oedipus," *AJP* 78 (1957) 36-51. 3 Cf. "Night," *Standard Dictionary of Folklore, Mythology, and Legend* (New York 1949) II 791-792. An allusion to the plague-imagery (cf. H. Musurillo, loc. cit., *supra*, n. 2) can perhaps be seen in the reference to "Night." For disease-causing demons rove through the night. 4 For a presentation of the conflicting attitudes about oracles, prophecy, and prophets, among the "tyrants" of Sophocles' time, cf. Bernard Knox, *Oedipus at Thebes* (New Haven 1957) 45-46, 169-173.

"Flentibus Amicis"

(Continued from page 4)

was concerned with literary works is suggested as existing in the few fragments which are extant of Horace's model Lucilius in his *Iter Siculum*.¹⁷ Some of these fragments indicate that this satirist extended his humorous criticism to such *genres* as the plays of Accius and—in later books—to epic, as is shown in the numerous mock-heroic reflections of verses from Ennius.¹⁸ Moreover, one of the fragments of Lucilius has reference to an incident connected with Diomedes' return from Troy.¹⁹ There are extant twelve fragments of a tragedy by Accius entitled *Diomedes*.²⁰

It would be presumptuous to expect that the interpretation here offered of Horace's famous satire satisfies all conditions. Horace has followed his own principles to the utmost (*Sat.* 1.10.11-14): *et sermone opus est modo tristi, saepe iocoso*. The seriousness of his criticism of the futility of peace when there is no peace is covered up with a smile. He proposes to act the part of the rhetor and the poet—the lecturer and the creator—*urbanus* at times, while artfully restraining the powers of expression of a poet who designedly plays in a lower key (*parentis viribus atque/extenuantis eas consulto*). Or, using another medium, Horace has presented us with a series of outline sketches which he invites the reader to fill in. The poet's contemporaries who could read the satire of Lucilius in its original form were able to fill in these outlines. The *litterati* of Horace's day appreciated a technique which later has become more and more baffling to us, the *grammatici*.

The fifth satire is a masterpiece of its kind. The literary art of this satire conforms to certain principles set down by Yeats (cited in *The Irish Review*, September, 1911, p. 327) as indicative of excellence in the art of dramatic presentation: "Only that which does not teach, which does not cry out, which does not condescend, which does not explain, is irresistible."

John J. Savage

Cambridge, Massachusetts

NOTES

1 Herbert A. Musurillo, S.J. "Horace's Journey to Brundisium—Fact or Fiction?" *CW* 48 (1955) 159-162; W. S. Anderson, "Poetic Fiction—Horace, *Serm.* 1.5," *CW* 49 (1955) 57-59. On *flentibus amicis*, see Musurillo 162: "Why did Varius have to leave the company at Canusium? Surely this reflects an actual incident." . . . "the apparent authenticity of this detail, whose significance has now completely escaped us . . ."; cf. Anderson 57: "the departure of Rufus <Varius Rufus> and the reaction of his friends constitutes a potential objection to his <Musurillo's> conclusions" that Horace is presenting us with fiction rather than fact. 2 Servius Danielis on *Aen.* 8.9 cites Lucilius (inc. sed. rel. v.1149 Marx, with notes pp. 363f.): "Diomedes reperit . . . uxorem apud Argos cum Cularaba, ut Lucilius . . . turpiter vivere . . . noluit reverti ad patriam . . . sed tenuit partes Apuliae . . . civitates plurimas condidit." Lucilius, therefore, seems to

have made reference to Diomedes' reluctance to return to his home in Argos because of his wife's unfaithfulness. There is no evidence that Lucilius depicted the incident when they arrived in Apulia of the metamorphosis of Diomedes' companions into birds. Marx notes: "Usus erat hac fabula Lucilius cum mulierum perfidiam demonstraret et inconstantiam." 3 *Epist.* 2.1.245; *A.P.* 55; Quintilian 10.3.8. 4 *Ilias* 5.778-882; *Aen.* 10.28-30; 11.252-277; cf. Servius Danielis on *Aen.* 8.9, where there is a summary of Diomedes' adventures after the fall of Troy (*supra*, note 2); Serv. and Serv. Dan. *Aen.* 11.239 and 246; Serv. *Aen.* 11.269 and 271 (*aves Diomedae*); *RE* s.v. Diomedes, col. 820f. (Bethe); *OCD* s.v. 5 G. M. A. Grube, "Theophrastus as a Literary Critic," *TAPA* 83 (1952) 175. 6 *Sat.* 1.10.8-14, especially the following: "et sermone opus est modo tristi, saepe iocosus, defendente vicem modo rhetoris atque poetae, interdum urbani, parentis viribus atque extenuantis eas consulto." 7 An attempt has been made to equate Heliodorus with Apollodorus, teacher of Octavian; cf. T. Frank, *CP* 15 (1920) 393. There may be a "psychological foreshadowing" here (cf. B. L. Ullman, *AJP* 71 [1950] 408-409). The rhetor's presence may be indicative of the introduction of the literary genres which follow. It may be well to note that Horace in *Carm.* 3.4.41 calls the heavenly (*de caelo* 1) Muses "givers of good counsel" (cf. Helio-dorus). Cf. A. W. Allen, *TAPA* 80 (1949) 64, n. 29. 8 Cf. *RE* s.v. Diomedes, loc. cit. (*supra*, n. 4). 9 Cf. Alfred Noyes, *Horace: A Portrait* (New York 1947) 89. 10 Teuffel-Kroll-Skutsch, *Gesch. röm. Lit.* (6th ed. 1916) 1.17.3; O. Ribbeck, *Comic. frag.* (*Scaen. Rom. Poes.* 2 II) has a fragment of Titinius (p. 133) entitled *Veliterna*, in which reference is made to a *togula* (v.s. 138). 11 J. W. Duff, *A Literary History of Rome* (New York 1932) 221; Lucilius introduced a Syrian hostess into his *Iter*: "caupona hic tamen una Syra" (3.128 M.). There is only one fragment extant of *Maccus Copo* by Novius (p. 262 R.). 12 Duff, op. cit. (*supra*, n. 11) 222 notes the undercurrent of political satire in the mime; cf. Anderson, loc. cit. (*supra*, n. 1) 57. 13 On the necessity of avoiding pollution of sacred springs, see G. Wis-sowa, *Rel. u. Kult. d. Röm.* (1912) 222. Cf. Servius Danielis on *Aen.* 8.564, discussing *Feronia mater*: in *huius templo Terracinae sedile lapideum fuit, in quo hic versus incisus erat 'bene meriti servi sedeant, surgunt liberi.' Quam Varro Libertatem deam dicit, Feroniam quasi Fidoniam. A reference to a temple of Diana Faelina was made by Lucilius in his *Iter* (3.104 M.). 14 The reference to Tantalus in Lucilius (frag. 140 M.) may have furnished the occasion for such an episode; cf. Fiske, *Lucilius and Horace* (Madison 1920) 310. 15 Is this a jocular reference to Pollio? L. H. Feldman, "Asinius Pollio and his Jewish interests," *TAPA* 84 (1953) 76, states: "Of all the poets of the period it is Horace, Pollio's close friend, who most prominently mentions the Jews." See also 78-80 for his discussion of the Jewish associations of Pollio. Is the description of the marvelous event of Gnatia a satirical reflection of Vergil, *Ecl.* 8.105-108? 16 Cf. M. V. Cunningham, *CP* 52 (1957) 100: "In a poem of Horace (*Od.* 1.9) what follows should be judged in terms of what preceded and vice-versa." 17 Cf. Marx on Lucilius 3.148; 9.348; 10.384; 28.794; cf. Fiske, op. cit. (*supra*, n. 14) 336. 18 Imitation or parody of Ennius is found frequently in Lucilius. No extant passage from the third book—the *Iter Siculum*—contains an Ennian parallel (Index nom. propr., Marx). 19 Cf. note 4, *supra*. 20 O. Ribbeck, *Trag. frag.* (*Scaen. Rom. Poes.* 2) I p. 171, gives the twelve extant fragments of the *Diomedes* of Accius. Lucilius (cf. Horace, *Sat.* 1.10.53) seems to have parodied the tragedies of Accius.*

Breviora

Semple Scholarship Grant for Athens

The Classical Association of the Middle West and South offers to a teacher of Latin or Greek within its territory the Semple Scholarship Grant for study in Athens or Rome. For the summer of 1960 the award will be for study at the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. This grant of \$250 is made in cooperation with the American School which will match it with an additional \$250.

Applicants will fill out forms which will be supplied by the Chairman of the Committee on Awards, Professor Grace L. Beede, State University of South Dakota, Vermillion. The initial letter of application must be in her hands not later than January 1. Selection will be made in February. Because of the need to make early reservations for trans-Atlantic travel, applicants are urged to write promptly.

The other members of the Committee on Awards are: Elizabeth Conn, Clarksdale, Mississippi; William B. Hetherington, S.J., Xavier University; William C. Korfmacher, Saint Louis University; and Carl Roebuck, Northwestern University.

Grace L. Beede

University of South Dakota

On a Review of Mohrmann's *Liturgical Latin*

In the March issue of THE CLASSICAL BULLETIN, in a review of Christine Mohrmann's small but very informative book, *Liturgical Latin*, it is stated by the reviewer, the Reverend M. J. Costelloe, S.J., that this volume should be in every library, since it places the discussion of the use of the vernacular in the Roman liturgy "at an intellectual level where it can rationally be discussed." Does this mean to imply that the vernacular has not heretofore been discussed "rationally," or that the discussion must be reserved to scholars? Or that the arguments of the pro-vernacularists are irrational?

It should be noted—though the reviewer strangely passes over this fact and thereby gives a one-sided account—that Miss Mohrmann admits the need for the use of vernacular in the "communication forms" of the liturgy (p. 85). She is uncertain whether the vernacular should also be used in the "expressional forms."

It is probably true that a change to the vernacular in the "expressional forms" would cause some difficulties, owing to the fluctuating state in which the liturgy presently is. But it should be emphasized that these difficulties would be no greater than those that are actually staring us in the face right now owing to the continued use of Latin.

If one is going to approach this matter from the standpoint of "sacral language," one may point out that English has already been adapted to sacral purposes. The Anglican prayers are first-class proof of "prayer forms which are far removed, in their style and mode of expression, from the language of everyday life." But it must be stressed that a "sacral" language is not necessarily an unintelligible one. The western Church in the fourth century chose a formalized sacral Latin; but, in spite of this, most of it could be understood by most of the people.

Over and above all this, I think we must admit that—whatever the views of the fourth century Christians—a different view has emerged in the twentieth century. Scholasticism, Protestantism, and Modernism have made us conscious of the need of intelligibility and precision (a fact to which Miss Mohrmann alludes on p. 10). The liturgy, to use the definition of our late and much lamented Holy Father, is "the public worship rendered by the Mystical Body of Christ in the entirety of its Head and members." This worship is embodied in a collection of rituals, symbolic actions, prayers, and readings which are designed to clarify and dramatize the signs of sanctification that God had bequeathed to us. It can hardly be considered unreasonable to suggest that the language used, in, say, the Foremass, be such as to make the meaning of the worship clear to the participants, and thus prepare them for the essential mystery, which is the Consecration.

Francis Joseph Guentner, S.J.

Saint Louis University

Editor's Note: The items "Deaths among Classicists," "Meetings of Classical Interest," and "Personalalia Quaedam," are scheduled for the December, February, and April numbers.

Reviews

Robert Payne, *The Gold at Troy: the Story of Schliemann and the Buried Cities of Ancient Greece*. New York, Funk and Wagnalls, 1959. Pp. 273. \$3.95.

Schliemann's astonishing archaeological adventures have long attracted both those who believe in the existence and value of the talented amateur and those who enjoy mysterious tales of hidden treasure. Here was a self-made business man who, in his middle forties, turned, without any particular qualifications except an extreme veneration for Homer, to the business of excavating the two poles of the Homeric story—Troy and Mycenae.

If the reader pictures Schliemann as any sort of romantic adventurer or idealist, the story, which is told in a skillful, vivid, and by no means unfriendly manner, will give him a rude shock. Schliemann appears to have been a liar, some-

thing inept. a very degree

The tainly Schlie indecis in sen indic tive, n to inte of this to be h

The with g unawa first g was gr all fin Turkis worker smuggl achiev operati where through achieve less im

Wer man w driving is not e and hi moving approa

Whe to save Gladsto yet Go had ser had pla cided to cunning the lav Both book.

Saint L Creve C

Aure contra prenta

This with an face to series p Cuyo. I of the as it m fact bec widely r by an e by a m these m have pr and dist

Saint L

Creve C

Dona Rhetoric August Press, 1

The varying cal criti Profess and con which th Howell in Char Rhetoric of the A three e

thing of a libertine, often unscrupulous, and sometimes even inept. His motive for the excavations seems to have been to a very small degree love of scholarship, and to a very large degree love of gold.

The author could well have been more selective, and certainly gives too much space to the rather unhappy details of Schliemann's first marriage. Although the unhappiness and indecision which marked it were certainly important factors in sending Schliemann on his travels, this could have been indicated much more economically. He was curiously insensitive, not only to people but also to places. "He found little to interest him in Jerusalem." Nonetheless, the central part of this book is fascinating, and once he starts upon what was to be his life's achievement, the story never flags.

The actual discovery of the main treasure of Troy is told with great skill. The reader, as it were, stumbles on it half unawares, just like Schliemann himself. Having caught the first glimpse of it, Schliemann, whose permission to excavate was granted only on the condition, proposed by himself, that all finds should be shared equally between himself and the Turkish government, with typical skull-duggery dismissed his workers, dug up the treasure with his second wife's help, and smuggled it out of the country. This was his crowning achievement and marked an epoch in archaeology. Subsequent operations were less startling and, in fact, only in Crete, where his negotiations for buying the site of Knossos fell through, was a similar opportunity open to him. What he achieved in Ithaca and Tiryns, and even in Mycenae, was of less importance.

Were there no redeeming features in the character of the man who achieved so much? Certainly he had a tremendous driving force, pushing himself to amazing achievements. This is not especially endearing, but his constant devotion to Homer and his fairly frequent solicitude for his second wife are moving at times; and there were moments in his life when he approached humor.

When Gladstone, then Prime Minister of England, failed to save Gordon at Khartoum, Schliemann was in a quandary. Gladstone had written a long preface to his book on Mycenae; yet Gordon was the man whom he most admired. Gladstone had sent Schliemann a signed photograph which Schliemann had placed in his study. Should he now destroy it? "He decided to be more cautious and with typically Mecklenburger cunning punished Gladstone by installing the photograph in the lavatory."

Both the amateur and the professional should enjoy this book.

Timothy Horner, O.S.B.

Saint Louis Priory School,
Creve Coeur, Missouri

Aurelio R. Bujaldon, editor, *Cicero: Segunda Acci3n contra Verres, Libro Quinto, Los Supplicios*. Mendoza, Imprenta Best, 1957. Pp. xvi, 107.

This is an edition of the fifth book of the Verrines fortified with an introduction, notes, and a translation into Spanish, face to face with the Latin text. It appears to be one of a series produced in Argentina by the Universidad Nacional de Cuyo. It makes no pretense of providing a new critical edition of the text and the translation keeps as close to the Latin as it may. One thinks of the Bud6 classics, whose text has in fact been used here, and wishes that this series may be as widely read as that. The reader's confidence is a little shaken by an *errata* list of eighteen items, and a little more shaken by a misprint in the correction of the second *erratum*, but these may be ascribed to the printer. The editor seems to have produced a serviceable edition; may it be one of a long and distinguished series.

Timothy Horner, O.S.B.

Saint Louis Priory School,
Creve Coeur, Missouri

Donald C. Bryant, editor, *The Rhetorical Idiom: Essays in Rhetoric, Oratory, Language and Drama presented to Herbert August Wichelns*. Ithaca, New York, Cornell University Press, 1958. Pp. viii, 334. \$6.00.

The essays in this collection are united by a relation in varying degrees to the common theme of rhetoric and rhetorical criticism. The collection starts fittingly with a reprint of Professor Wichelns' essay on the literary criticism of oratory, and continues with a group of general rhetorical essays of which the most interesting are contributed by Wilbur Samuel Howell ("Renaissance Rhetoric and Modern Rhetoric, a Study in Change"), Richard Murphy ("Preface to an Ethic of Rhetoric"), and Leland N. Griffin ("The Rhetorical Structure of the Anti-Masonic Movement"). There is then a group of three essays dealing respectively with Oliver Cromwell,

Adolph Hitler, and Richard Brinsley Sheridan, and finally a group dealing with rhetoric in the theater and in poetry. One or two of the other essays seem either captious in their criticism or excessively polysyllabic in their expression. They may, however, be of greater interest to specialist readers than they are to the general public. Professor Wichelns' essay is a lucid exposition of the main thesis that oratory is the impact on an audience of the man speaking, and that its aim is to persuade a particular audience in a particular way. What distinguishes oratory from written prose is that it is the spoken word aimed at a particular group of listeners. This specific difference should be reflected in rhetorical criticism. An extended quotation from Professor Wichelns will show what he means by this: "The scheme of a rhetorical study includes the element of the speaker's personality as a conditioning factor; it includes also the public character of the man—not what he was, but what he was thought to be. It requires a description of the speaker's audience and of the leading ideas with which he plied his hearers. . . . These will reveal his own judgment of human nature in his audiences and also his judgment on the question which he discussed. Attention must be paid, too, to the relation of the surviving texts to what was actually uttered. . . . Nor can rhetorical criticism omit the speaker's mode of arrangement and his mode of expression, nor his habit of preparation and his manner of delivery from the platform, though the last two are perhaps less significant. 'Style,' in the sense which corresponds to diction and sentence movement, must receive attention, but only as one among various means that secure for the speaker ready access to the minds of his auditors."

There seem to be two points about this: one positive, the emphasis on the impact of the speaker on this particular group of hearers, and one negative, the soft pedalling of the elements of diction and structure. These ideas are taken up and amplified in a rather heavy essay by L. H. Mouat, ("An Approach to Rhetorical Criticism"). There is both truth and danger in them. It is true that what distinguishes oratory from written prose is the contact with and impact upon a particular audience, but there is also a danger that if oratory is made a stranger to the more enduring qualities of written prose in form and structure, it will become ephemeral. It would seem that to exclude these from rhetorical criticism on the grounds that they do not concern the specific difference of oratory would be rather like defining a giraffe as an animal with a long neck and then saying that any account of a giraffe should concern itself only with those actions and characteristics which it has by reason of the length of its neck, such as the ability to nibble the tops of trees.

There is a real danger, also, of making all critical standards relative and leaving none that are absolute. Mr. Wichelns, himself, seems to have been quite aware of this danger. It is not so clear that his followers are equally aware of it. The appraisals of individual orators in this book, however, do show balance in their consideration of the man in his historical setting and of his particular relations to his audiences. It is however, rather paradoxical that in the essay on Sheridan, which is concerned especially with his great speech on the Begums of Oude, we are given lengthy quotations, from contemporaries, dealing with the effect that this speech had on the audience but practically nothing of the speech itself. It is, after all, the words which actually make the impact on the audience.

The casual student of oratory may often have asked himself why the present age is on the whole hostile to and suspicious of rhetoric. Some very interesting light is thrown on this in Professor Howell's essay on the change from Renaissance to Modern Rhetoric. He summarizes the change by saying, that it has been one "from the convention of imperial dress to the convention of the business suit," and suggests, among other reasons for it, the rise of the scientific spirit with its stress on observation rather than on rational inquiry, with the consequent stress on documents and facts, rather than on general principles; the passing of aristocracy; the rise of a business man's culture, and the rise of a theory of inquiry supplanting the theory of communication. By this last, he means, I think, that instead of paying heed to Logic and Rhetoric, which were regarded before and during the Renaissance as the special arts of communication, we concentrate more on science and similar disciplines of observation. It is indeed surprising, if true, that our hardheaded business men have failed to see how much they depend at every step on persuaders, whether hidden or open. There is a great deal in this essay which is worthy of thought, and one may hope that the author will at some time elaborate the ideas contained in it. The reader must be left to read the other essays for himself. No one except a reviewer should read this

book from cover to cover, but many people of many tastes will find things in it which will interest them and stimulate further consideration.

Timothy Horner, O.S.B.

Saint Louis Priory School,
Creve Coeur, Missouri

H. M. D. Parker, *The Roman Legions*. Photographically reprinted, with corrections and a new bibliography by G. R. Watson. New York, Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1958. Pp. vi, 296. \$7.00.

The *Roman Legions* first appeared in 1928 and was at the time well received, as a book of its scholarlyness and usefulness deserved. The author has provided a Preface to the present reprint (p. vi), indicating the insertion of certain factual corrections, with some "embodied in the text," while "the others are included in a list of corrigenda" (p. vi). He then adds that "Mr. G. R. Watson of Nottingham University has kindly compiled an up to date bibliography of books and articles about the Roman legionary army."

Present interest in ever newer and more fantastic arms and ever newer and more surprising concepts of the use of man power in warfare has caused a glance backward as well as forward. There is an increasing interest in the way the ancients fought, in their arms, and in their military organization. While Mr. Parker's work is primarily for the specialist in Roman history and the history of the art of warfare, it is rewarding likewise to the general reader's browsing.

Hence the reprinting is welcome. Readers may be disturbed by a slight confusion in pagination, since pages i-vi, small roman, seem to be recounted in the arabic numbered pages, the fourth of which is page 10.

Saint Louis University William Charles Korfmacher

1960 SUMMER SESSIONS

The University of Wisconsin

The 75th Anniversary of Summer Sessions

The FIFTH WISCONSIN LATIN WORKSHOP

Three weeks: June 20 - July 8, 1960

PURPOSE

1. To take Latin teachers out of isolation and give them the chance to discuss their work with like-minded persons from a wide variety of backgrounds.

2. To give teachers an opportunity to work, eat, and live together, and to solve some of their teaching problems.

3. To suggest ways in which new research into the wealth of classical civilization may be applied to enrich and enliven teaching.

PROGRAM

A LINGUISTIC APPROACH TO LATIN

Bock

A UNIT IN CLASSICAL SCULPTURE

Agard

A NEW APPROACH TO CICERO

MacKendrick

LATIN LABORATORY:

Weightman

New books, audio-visual aids, an illustrated unit in Roman archaeology, coins, ACL materials, model examinations, club work, assembly programs, relations with guidance counselors, oral Latin.

GRADUATE CREDIT

Three (3) hours in either Latin or Education. The Workshop may be included in the regular Eight-Week Summer Session, and may be taken for credit more than once in successive years.

FEES

Tuition, about \$36.00. A special Latin wing has been reserved for Workshop participants in a lakeside dormitory. Room and board, about \$75.00.

APPLICATIONS

The Workshop is limited to fifty (50) members. Deadline for application is June 1, 1960.

For further information, write

Professor Paul MacKendrick, Bascom Hall,
The University of Wisconsin, Madison 6

Materials Available

through the Office of
The Classical Bulletin

Richard E. Arnold, S.J., Editor

CLASSICAL ESSAYS PRESENTED
TO JAMES A. KLEIST, S.J.

Containing an INTRODUCTION by the Editor, with articles by Walter R. Agard, William H. Alexander, Norman J. DeWitt, Charles C. Mierow, Clyde Murley, John A. Scott, Francis A. Sullivan, S.J.

Each, \$2.50

Thomas P. Byrne, S.J.

FACETE DICTUM: A LATIN READER WITH A
DASH OF HUMOR

Light-hearted reading for those with a year and a half or more of systematic training in Latin.

Each, \$1.00

General Index

TO VOLUMES 1-25 OF THE CLASSICAL
BULLETIN (1924-1949)

Each, 50c

William R. Hennes, S.J., and Richard E. Arnold, S.J.

IRIS: A READING LIST OF ARTICLES
SELECTED FROM CLASSICAL PERIODICALS

Chosen from nine periodicals from the beginning of each until August 1, 1941.

Each, \$1.50

Leo M. Kaiser

T. MACCIUS PLAUTUS, THE CAPTIVES:
EDITED WITH INTRODUCTION, NOTES,
AND VOCABULARY

Intended for rapid reading in lower classes.

Each, \$1.25

William C. Korfmacher

OTHLONI LIBELLUS PROVERBIORUM

Critical and annotated edition of an eleventh-century proverb collection.

Each, \$2.00

O. J. Kuhnmuensch, S.J.

AIDS FOR THE RHYTHMIC READING
OF VERGIL

SOME AIDS TO LATIN

Each, 5c; in lots of 12 or more, each, 4c

Raymond V. Schoder, S.J.

CLASSICAL BOOKS FOR
HIGH SCHOOL NEEDS

Each, 5c; in lots of 12 or more, each, 4c

Sense-Line Texts . . .

Cicero, IN CATILINAM ORATIO PRIMA
(Peterson)

Cicero, IN CATILINAM ORATIO TERTIA
(Bachhuber)

Cicero, IN CATILINAM ORATIO QUARTA
(Giunta)

Cicero, PRO ARCHIA (Peterson)

Each, 25c; in lots of 12 or more, each, 20c

Address:

The Classical Bulletin

221 North Grand Boulevard

Saint Louis 3, Missouri

All items are sent plus postage

A
E
0
A
d
0
c
J.
g
0
25
h-
00
4c
4c
20c